

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 04 2008

FAX TRANSMISSION

DATE: August 4, 2008

PTO IDENTIFIER: Application Number 09/915,945-Conf. #9612
Patent Number

Inventor: Charles Paclat

MESSAGE TO: US Patent and Trademark Office

FAX NUMBER: (571) 273-8300

FROM: FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

C. Andrew Im

PHONE: (212) 318 3359

Attorney Dkt. #: NY-THEOR 205-US1 (10107436)

PAGES (Including Cover Sheet): 28

CONTENTS: Fee Transmittal (1 page)
Appeal Brief (23 pages)
Appeal Brief Transmittal (1 page)
Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached (1 page)
Charge \$510.00 to credit card
Certificate of Transmission (1 page)

If your receipt of this transmission is in error, please notify this firm immediately by collect call to sender at (212) 318-3359 and send the original transmission to us by return mail at the address below.

This transmission is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or duplication of this transmission by someone other than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited.

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
666 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10103
Telephone: (212) 318-3000 Facsimile: (212) 318-3400

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 04 2008

PTO/SB/97 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Application No. (if known): 09/975,945

Attorney Docket No.: NY-THEOR 205-US1

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

on August 4, 2008
Date



Signature

C. Andrew Im

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

40,657

Registration Number, if applicable

(212) 318-3359

Telephone Number

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Fee Transmittal (1 page)

Appeal Brief (23 pages)


Appeal Brief Transmittal (1 page)

Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached (1 page)

Charge \$510.00 to credit card

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 04 2008

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF			Docket No. NY-THEOR 205-US1	
In re Application of: Charles Paclat				
Application No. 09/975,945-Conf. #9812	Filing Date October 11, 2001	Examiner A. Khatri	Group Art Unit 2191	
Invention: METHOD FOR DEVELOPING BUSINESS COMPONENTS				
<u>TO THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS:</u>				
Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application, with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed: <u>June 3, 2008</u>				
The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is <u>\$ 510.00</u>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large Entity <input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity				
<input type="checkbox"/> A petition for extension of time is also enclosed. The fee for the extension of time is _____				
<input type="checkbox"/> A check in the amount of _____ is enclosed.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Charge the amount of the fee to Deposit Account No. <u>50-0624</u> This sheet is submitted in duplicate.				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. <u>50-0624</u> This sheet is submitted in duplicate.				
			Dated: <u>August 4, 2008</u>	
C. Andrew Im Attorney Reg. No. : 40,657 FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P. 666 Fifth Avenue New York, New York 10103 (212) 318-3359				

55258152.1

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

AUG 04 2008

**Docket No.: NY-THEOR 205-US1
(PATENT)**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**In re Patent Application of:
Charles Paclat**

Application No.: 09/975,945

Confirmation No.: 9612

Filed: October 11, 2001

Art Unit: 2191

**For: METHOD FOR DEVELOPING BUSINESS
COMPONENTS**

Examiner: A. Khatri

APPEAL BRIEF

**MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Dear Sir:

As required under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(a), this brief is filed more than two months after the Notice of Appeal filed in this case on June 3, 2008, and is in furtherance of said Notice of Appeal.

The fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2) are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and M.P.E.P. § 1206:

08/05/2008 PCHOMP 00000043 09975945

01 FC:1402

510.00 0P

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

I	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
II	RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.....	4
III	STATUS OF CLAIMS.....	5
	A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION	5
	B. CURRENT STATUS OF CLAIMS.....	5
	C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL.....	5
IV	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	6
V	SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	7
VI	GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	9
VII	ARGUMENT	10
	A. §102(E) REJECTION	10
	1. Goodwin Does Not Teach or Suggest Any of The Claimed Steps.....	11
	2. Goodwin Does Not Teach or Suggest Additional Elements	
	Taught by Dependent Claims.....	14
	B. §103 REJECTION	16
VIII	CONCLUSION.....	18
	CLAIMS APPENDIX (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(C)(VIII)).....	19
	LISTING OF CLAIMS ON APPEAL	19
	EVIDENCE APPENDIX (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(C)(IX)).....	22
	RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX (37 C.F.R. § 41.37 (C)(X)).....	23

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 04 2008

I REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party interest is the assignee, BEA Systems, Inc.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 04 2008 THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

II RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

AUG 0 4 2008

III STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 18 claims pending in application.

B. Current Status of Claims

1. Claims canceled: NONE
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: NONE
3. Claims pending: 1-18
4. Claims allowed: NONE
5. Claims rejected: 1-18

C. Claims On Appeal

The claims on appeal are claims 1-18

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 04 2008

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

IV STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Appellant did not file an Amendment After Final Rejection.

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 04 2008

V SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claimed subject matter is recited in sole independent claim 1 directed to a method for developing an Enterprise JavaBean (EJB) component by utilizing a phased approach to quickly develop and introduce products into the market, thereby reducing the time to market. (*See e.g.*, Figs. 1-2; Specification at page 4, line 18 to page 6, line 10). The present process enables the user/developer to research business problems or domain (i.e., business project) and transforms them into EJB components. (*See e.g.*, Figs. 1-7; Specification at page 4, line 18 to page 26, line 14).

The present method, as required in independent claim 1, comprises the step of analyzing a business domain to generate functional requirements that models the business domain. (*See* Specification at page 6, lines 18-21). The functional requirements define a scope of the business functionality for a new set of components, and include a summary of a list of inputs and eFunction Matrix. (*See* Specification at page 7, line 20 to page 12, line 17; Table 1 (an example of eFunction Matrix)). "The list of inputs can include, but is not limited, to interacting components, industry analysts, related industry standards, commercial packages, related engagements and system integrators, additional in-house resources, and eFunction Matrix." (Specification at page 7, line 33 to page 8, line 3).

Additionally, the present method, as required in independent claim 1, comprises the step of transforming the functional requirements into an EJB component model, preferably using a UML drawing tool. (*See* Specification at page 12, line 19 to page 21, line 6). "The NCD [new component development] process turns the functional requirements into an object oriented model that encapsulates the data model and the process model." (Specification at page 6, lines 22-23, page 13, lines 2-4). For example, "the NCD process uses the unified modeling language (UML) modeling tool to perform the object oriented analysis and design." (Specification at page 12, lines 21-22). "[T]he

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

NCD process refines the general descriptions generated in the analysis phase 110 into a design document from which implementation or construction of the components can be started.” (Specification at page 12, line 31 to page 13, line 2). To simplify the complexity of the UML diagrams, the present invention describes relationships between objects through class stereotypes rather than inheritance. Each class stereotypes model certain behaviors and implies the presence of additional methods. The present invention utilizes the following class stereotypes: Belongings, Sessions, Entity, Configurable Entity, Business Policy, Workflow, and Smart features (e.g., SmartKey, SmartHandle, SmartValue). (Specification at page 13, line 29 to page 21, line 6).

Further, the present method, as required in independent claim 1, comprises the step of building EJB component from the EJB component model that encompass the business functionality of the business domain. (See Specification at page 21, line 8 to page 25, line 10). “The implementation phase 130 of the NCD is the implementation or building of the component themselves. In the implementation phase 130, the NCD process generates the relational mappings and deployment descriptors.” (Specification at page 21, lines 9-11). The NCD process generates the classes that represent business components and “Java Doc,” and compiles and deploys the components with the simplest form of persistence. Additionally, for example, the NCD process installs the Bean class and its supporting classes in the EJB server with container-managed persistence (CMP) to provide deployable components. (Specification at 21, lines 17-24).

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)**VI GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,199,195 to Goodwin et al. (hereinafter "Goodwin"). This may be seen at page 2 of the final Office Action.

Claim 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Goodwin in view of U.S. Patent 6,944,680 to Lee et al. (hereinafter "Lee"). This may be seen at page 2 of the final Office Action.

It is believed that these rejections are in error, and reversal is requested.

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)**VII ARGUMENT****A. §102(e) Rejection**

Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Goodwin, and will be argued together.

A rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that the cited reference disclose each and every element covered by the claim. *Electro Medical Systems S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences Inc.*, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1017, 1019 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient Inc.*, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1767-68 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988); *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2D 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 827 (1987). The Federal Circuit has mandated that 35 U.S.C. 102 requires no less than "complete anticipation ... [a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art disclosure of all elements of a claimed invention arranged as in the claim." *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 772 F.2d 1542, 1548, 220 U.S.P.Q. 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *See also, Electro Medical Systems*, 32 U.S.P.Q. 2d at 1019; *Verdegaal Bros.*, 814 F.2d at 631.

Appellant respectfully submits that these same claims 1-16 were also finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,564 to Fontana et al. (hereinafter "Fontana") on August 30, 2005. Appellant filed its Appeal Brief on February 6, 2006 incorporating essentially the same arguments (as in its July 25, 2005 response to the initial Office Action dated May 23, 2005) in response to the Final Office Action of August 30, 2005.

In response to Appellant's Appeal Brief, the Examiner withdrew the final rejection based on Fontana and issued another non-final Office Action dated April 20, 2007 based on a new reference (U.S. Patent No. 7,086,065 to Yeluripati et al. (hereinafter "Yeluripati")), which was not even a prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102. Appellant filed

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

response and declaration on August 15, 2007 establishing appellant's earlier reduction to practice date. In response, the Examiner withdrew his non-final Office Action of April 20, 2007 based on Yeluripati and issued yet another non-final Office Action dated October 16, 2007 based on Goodwin (the prior art reference at issue herein).

Appellant's current arguments are essentially same as its Appeal Brief of February 6, 2006 because Goodwin is no better than Fontana in teaching or suggesting all of the claim limitations of the present application. Accordingly, it is unclear to appellant why Goodwin is relevant as a prior art reference when it fails to teach or suggest any of the claimed steps of independent claim 1.

1. Goodwin Does Not Teach or Suggest Any of The Claimed Steps

The Examiner has failed to establish a case that Goodwin is an anticipatory reference under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because Goodwin does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of independent claim 1. In fact, appellant respectfully submits that Goodwin (as with Fontana) does not teach or suggest any of the claim steps of independent claim 1.

a. Goodwin Does Not Teach or Suggest The Claimed Step Of Analyzing

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Goodwin does not teach or suggest the step of "analyzing a business domain to determine functional requirements of said business domain," as required in independent claim 1. In fact, the passage cited by the Examiner (Goodwin at col. 11, lines 36-55), teaches that a meta object facility defines and manipulates a set "of meta models." Goodwin explains that a "model is a set of business objects that makes up a running software application." (Goodwin at col. 11, lines 38-40). Thus, Goodwin merely describes identifying and manipulating pre-existing software objects that make up a running software application. The present invention, however,

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

analyzes business domains to determine functional requirements of the business domain. A business domain includes business problems or projects. (See, Specification at page 3, lines 14-15; Abstract). It is appreciated that one of ordinary skill in the art would not equate “meta models” with “business projects.” Moreover, the present invention necessarily analyzes the business domains to determine functional requirements prior to even generating any “models.” (Specification at page 7, lines 19-22; *see also*, page 7, line 19 to page 12, line 17). The very purpose of analyzing the business domain is to first determine the functional requirements to eventually generate a model. Goodwin, however, does not teach the analysis of any business domain to determine functional requirements. “To imbue one of ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of the present invention, when no prior art reference or references of record convey or suggest that knowledge, is to fall victim of the insidious effect of hindsight syndrome, wherein that which only the inventor taught is used against the teacher.” *W.L. Gore & Assoc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner cannot use hindsight gleaned from the present invention to contradict the clear teaching of the prior art reference to render claims unpatentable. The prior must to be judged based on a full and fair consideration of what that art teaches, not by using Appellant’s invention as a blueprint for gathering various bits and modifying the pieces in an attempt to reconstruct Appellant’s invention. Therefore, because Goodwin fails to teach or suggest the step of analyzing as required in claim 1 (and included in dependent claims 2-18), it follows that, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Goodwin does not anticipate or rendered obvious claim 1, or any of dependent claims 2-18.

b. Goodwin Does Not Teach or Suggest The Claimed Step Of Transforming

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Goodwin does not teach or suggest the step of “transforming said functional requirements into an EJB component model,” as required by independent claim 1. In fact the passage cited by the Examiner (Goodwin at

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

col. 7-8, lines 53-67 and 1-5), is directed to transforming data models into code: “[t]he system . . . provides application developers with a . . . approach . . . for generating code from a data model.” (Goodwin at col. 7, lines 66-67). On the other hand, the transforming step of the present invention requires that the *functional requirements* determined from analyzing the business domain be transformed into an EJB component *model* NOT into the code resulting from the data model. The Goodwin passage is directed to the transformation of a data model to code, which requires that the model already have been generated. The transforming step of the present invention, however, is directed to transforming the functional requirements determined from analyzing the business domain into an EJB component model. The prior must to be judged based on a full and fair consideration of what that art teaches, not by using Appellant’s invention as a blueprint for gathering various bits and modifying the pieces in an attempt to reconstruct Appellant’s invention. Therefore, because Goodwin fails to teach or suggest the step of transforming as required in claim 1 (and included in dependent claims 2-18), it follows that, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Goodwin again does not anticipate or render obvious claim 1, or any of dependent claims 2-18.

c. Goodwin Does Not Teach or Suggest The Claimed Step Of Building

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Goodwin does not teach or suggest the step of “building an EJB component in accordance with said EJB component model that encompass the business functionality of said business domain,” as required in claim 1. In fact, the passage cited by the Examiner (Goodwin at col. 12, lines, 25-25), generally explains that the repository adapter tool 312 uses “logical models from various modeling tools to generate the unified models” and that “each object within a unified model represents a unique structural feature of a software system.” (Goodwin at col. 12, lines 26). This passage does not teach building an EJB component in accordance with EJB component models that encompass the *business functionality* of a *business domain*. It is

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

respectfully submitted that Goodwin is merely teaching a system for generating source code by translating logical models into unified models and then generating a plurality of templates related thereto and generating the source code therefrom. (See, e.g., Goodwin at col. 3, lines 3-26). Goodwin does not teach or suggest the claimed step of “building an EJB component in accordance with said EJB component model that encompass the business functionality of said business domain,” as called for in independent claim 1. It is well established that the Examiner cannot use hindsight gleaned from the present invention to modify or reconstruct the prior art reference to render claims unpatentable. As such, because Goodwin fails to teach or suggest the step of building as required in claim 1 (and included in dependent claims 2-18), it follows that, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Goodwin once again does not anticipate or render obvious independent claim 1, or any of dependent claims 2-18.

2. Goodwin Does Not Teach or Suggest Additional Elements Taught by Dependent Claims

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Goodwin does not teach or suggest the following additional elements taught by dependent claims 2, 4-7, and 10-16:

Claim 2: Goodwin nowhere discloses providing a parallel development process.

Claim 4: Goodwin does not teach or suggest functional requirements let alone functional requirements the include data and process model of the business domain.

Claim 5: Goodwin does not teach or suggest EJB component model which encapsulates the data and process model of the said business domain.

Claim 6: Goodwin does not teach or suggest generating a list of inputs wherein each input identifies a resource relating to the business domain.

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

Claim 7: Goodwin. does not teach or suggest generating eFunction matrix from a list of inputs.

Claim 10: Goodwin does not teach or suggest building the EJB component from at least one of the following class stereotypes: Belonging, Session, Entity, Configurable Entity, Business Policy and Workflow.

Claim 11: Goodwin does not teach or suggest mapping eXtensible Markup Language (XML) to the EJB component model.

Claim 12: Goodwin does not teach or suggest dividing the business domain into one or more sub-domains, determining functional requirements for each of the sub-domains; and transforming each of the functional requirements for the sub-domains into the EJB component model.

Claim 13: Goodwin does not teach or suggest generating deployment descriptors.

Claim 14: Goodwin does not teach or suggest generating end-user documentation, developing unit tests to test the EJB component, and generating a reference implementation of the EJB component.

Claim 15: Goodwin et al. does not teach or suggest verifying the end-user documentation to the EJB component.

Claim 16: Goodwin does not teach or suggest packaging the EJB component for deployment with container managed persistence.

Therefore, because Goodwin fails to teach or suggest any of the claimed steps of claim 1, it follows that Goodwin cannot anticipate independent claim 1. As claims 2-16 depend from independent claim 1, Goodwin cannot anticipate those claims for the same reasons it does not anticipate claim 1. Appellant submits that the Examiner has

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

succumbed to the lure of prohibited hindsight reconstruction. Reconsideration is requested.

B. §103 Rejection

Claims 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being allegedly unpatentable over Goodwin and Lee, and will be argued together.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not be based on the Appellant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); MPEP 2143. Here, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the combination of Goodwin and Lee does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 17 and 18.

As explained above, Goodwin does not teach or suggest any of the steps of claim 1 and therefore of dependent claims 17 and 18. Moreover, as admitted by the Examiner, Goodwin does not teach or suggest that an EJB Component is a "Smart component having at least one of following Smart feature: SmartKey, SmartHandle and SmartValue." (October 16, 2007 Office Action at page 11). To cure this deficiency, the Examiner turns to Lee. Lee, however, does not describe the required steps of claim 1 (and incorporated into dependent claim 17 and 18): (a) analyzing a business domain to determine functional requirements of the business domain; (b) transforming the functional requirements into an EJB component model; and (c) building an EJB component in accordance with the EJB component model that encompass the business

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

functionality of said business domain. As such, neither Goodwin nor Lee, independently or in combination teaches or suggests each and every element of claims 17-18. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and has succumbed to the lure of prohibited hindsight reconstruction. Reconsideration is requested.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

AUG 04 2008

VIII CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit, none of pending claims 1-18 are anticipated by Goodwin nor rendered obvious by the combination of Goodwin and Lee. Therefore, appellant requests that the Board reverse the pending grounds for rejection.

Dated: August 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

C. Andrew Im

Registration No.: 40,657

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

666 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10103

(212) 318-3000

(212) 318-3400 (Fax)

Attorney for Appellant

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 04 2008

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

CLAIMS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(C)(VIII))

LISTING OF CLAIMS ON APPEAL

Claims on Appeal in Application Serial No. 09/975,945

1. (Original) A method for developing an Enterprise JavaBean (EJB) component, comprising the steps of:
 - (a) analyzing a business domain to determine functional requirements of said business domain;
 - (b) transforming said functional requirements into an EJB component model; and
 - (c) building an EJB component in accordance with said EJB component model that encompass the business functionality of said business domain.
2. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:
 - modifying said functional requirements by a user; and
 - repeating the steps (b) and (c) to provide a parallel development process.
3. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said EJB components are extensible and configurable.
4. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said functional requirements include data and process model of said business domain.
5. (Original) The method of claim 4, wherein said EJB component model encapsulates the data and process model of the said business domain.

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

6. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of analyzing includes the step of generating a list of inputs, each input identifying a resource that relate to said business domain.
7. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of generating eFunction matrix from said list of inputs.
8. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of transforming transforms said functional requirements using an unified modeling language (UML) tool to generate said EJB component model.
9. (Original) The method of claim 8, wherein said EJB component model includes a plurality of EJB classes.
10. (Original) The method of claim 9, wherein the step of building builds said EJB component from at least one of the following class stereotypes: Belonging, Session, Entity, Configurable Entity, Business Policy and Workflow.
11. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of transforming includes the step of mapping eXtensible Markup Language (XML) to said EJB component model.
12. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of analyzing includes the step of dividing said business domain into one or more sub-domains and determining functional requirements for each of said sub-domains; and wherein the step of transforming transforms each of said functional requirements for said sub-domains into said EJB component model.
13. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of building includes the step of generating relational mappings and deployment descriptors.

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

14. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of building includes the steps of:
 - generating end-user documentation;
 - developing unit tests to test said EJB component; and
 - generating a reference implementation of said EJB component.
15. (Original) The method of claim 14, further comprising the step of verifying said end-user documentation to said EJB component.
16. (Original) The method of claim 14, further comprising the step of packaging said EJB component for deployment with container managed persistence.
17. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said EJB component is a Smart component having at least one of following Smart feature: SmartKey, SmartHandle and SmartValue.
18. (Original) The method of claim 16, wherein said Smart component is an eBusiness Smart component.

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 04 2008

EVIDENCE APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(C)(IX))

None.

THEOR 205.1 (10107436)

RELATED PROCEEDINGS
APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37 (C)(X))

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 04 2008

None.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☒ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☒ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.